



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,255	03/17/2004	Pim van Meurs	TEGI0012CIP	5958

22862 7590 07/11/2007
GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER

HAN, QI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/11/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/803,255	Applicant(s) MEURS ET AL.	
	Examiner Qi Han	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04/16/2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7-25,27,29,31,33,35-56,58,60 and 62-81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7-25,27,29,31,33,35-56,58,60 and 62-81 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Response to Amendment

3. This communication is responsive to the applicant's amendment and RCE examination both filed on 04/16/2007. The applicant(s) amended claims 1, 3, 29, 33, 56 and 60 (see the amendment: pages 2-13).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 04/16/2007 with respect to the claim rejection under 35 USC 112 and 102/103, have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, since the newly amended claims introduce new issue and/or subject matter. It is noted that even though the amendment changes the scope of the claims, the previous cited references

Art Unit: 2626

are still applicable to the claims for the prior art rejection. The response to the arguments is directed to the corresponding claim rejection (see detail below).

In addition, it is noted that each of the newly amended claims 1, 29 and 56, in surface, includes two databases as claimed: “an input method specific database” and “an database”. However, according to the statement (see REMARKS of the amendment: page 19, paragraph 1) and the related specification disclosure (see the specification: page 11, lines 9-12 and Fig. 5), the claimed limitation “a database” is, in fact, referred to the same database as the claimed “an input method specific database” (substantially including only one database), which has no direct connection with claimed limitation “ideographic characters”. Therefore, the amendment not only fails to comply with the written description requirement, but also fails to comply with the completeness and/or enablement requirement. As best understood in view of the claim rejection under 35 USC 112 (see below), the prior art rejection is properly addressed, based on the Williams’ disclosure that uses both ‘interpretation logic and database’ and Chinese character database ‘GB-2312 (or Big5)’ for stroke/phonetic based input methods/modes (see detail below).

Further, regarding the applicant’s arguments that “applicant clearly teaches the requirement of **two input modalities to be active at the time of input**”, it appears that the applicant believes his claimed invention discloses “such **modes of operation may be active at the same time**” (see REMARKS of the amendment: page 21, paragraph 10). However, nowhere in the specification shows the specific description and enabled disclosure of this feature.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35-56, 58, 60, 62-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 1:

(i) the previous amended limitation “an (said) ideographic sequence database” still remains in the claim (see page 2, line 29), so that the rejection should be sustained.

(ii) the newly amended limitation “(said) **phonetic database...**” introduces the new subject matter, because the limitation is not specifically described in the original specification (see the closest disclosure in the specification: page 8, line 27 to page 9, line 3 and Fig. 8).

(iii) it appears that the newly amended limitation “a database ...said [phonetic] database containing ...” is copied from the specification, page 11, lines 9-12. However, it is noted that the database (see the corresponding drawing Fig. 8, block 520) in the specification is substantially referred to the claimed “an input method specific database”, so that the newly amended claim is nothing to do with the later claimed “ideographic characters”. In another word, the amended claim, as whole, is totally different from the specification disclosure and fails to comply with the written description requirement.

Regarding claims 29 and 56, the rejection is based on the same described for claim 1 (see issue iii above), because the claims include as least one of the same or similar problematic limitations as claim 1.

Regarding claims 3-5, 7-25, 27, 31, 33, 35-55, 58, 60, 62-81, the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 1, 29 and 56 (see above), because the dependent claims include the same or similar problematic limitations as their parent claims 1, 29 and 56 respectively.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-25, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the newly amended limitation “**said** phonetic database” and “**said** ideographic sequence database”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Regarding claims 3-5, 7-25 and 27, the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 1 (see above), because the dependent claims include the same or similar problematic limitations as their parent claims1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. Claims 1, 4-5, 7-15, 21-25, 29, 33, 35-43, 51-53, 56, 60, 62-70 and 76-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by WILLIAMS (2003/0144830 A1).

As per **claim 29**, as best understood in view of the claim rejection under 35 USC 112 1st (see above), WILLIAMS discloses ‘language module and method for user with text processing devices’ (title), comprising:

“a reduced keyboard input device having a plurality of input means, each of said input means being associated with at least one of a plurality of strokes and a plurality of phonetic characters, an input sequence being generated each time an input means is selected by said user, wherein the generated input sequence has an interpretation that is ambiguous due to the plurality of strokes or phonetic characters associated with each input means” (paragraph (hereinafter references as p) 34, ‘pressing keys (a plurality of input means) of a mobile telephone’; 46, ‘keypad (reduced keyboard)’; p59, ‘subsequent strokes can be entered’; p62, ‘enter the subsequent letter of the intended Chinese character’s phonetic spelling’ and ‘language model 104 receives this data (Pinyin)...either unambiguously or categorically as a group of two or more Latin letters and retunes a number of candidate characters (implying interpretation is ambiguous)’);

“an input method specific database containing at least one of a set of stroke sequences corresponding to input sequences and a set of phonetic sequences corresponding to input sequences”, (p58-p63, ‘language module 104 implements three user input modes (method)’, ‘subsequent strokes can be entered to further limit the list of candidate characters...’, ‘receive data ... in a series of input’, ‘generates a list of addresses of characters’; p54-p55, ‘contents of word buffer 210 is used by input interpretation logic and database 214 to better select language unit candidates according to the context of recently entered language units (can be a series of strokes or Pinyin letters)’; ‘support two different context modes’: ‘uses dictionary’ and ‘uses a list of proper nouns’, wherein the database necessarily and/or inherently contains stroke sequences and/or phonetic sequences);

“a database associated with both stroke sequences and phonetic sequences, [said database containing a set of phonetic sequences whose spellings correspond to said input sequence and a set of stroke sequences corresponding to the input sequence,] each sequence representing a phrase comprising two or more ideographic characters” (p58, implements both GB-2312 and Big5 standard character sets (corresponding the database) of the Chinese written language’; p35, ‘Font 216 store data (can also be interpreted as ideographic sequence database)’; wherein the database GB-2312 or Big5 necessarily and/or inherently associates with both stroke sequences and phonetics sequence, for supporting stroke based input mode and phonetic based input mode; p31, ‘stores data representing key strokes (sequence) entered by the user in specifying a message unit’ that ‘can be a character, a word, or a phrase’ including ‘multiple characters (two or more ideographic characters)’; also see p54);

“means for comparing an input sequence using said input method specific database and finding one or more stroke or phonetic sequences corresponding to the input sequence” (p59, ‘the user enters the first written stroke by pressing a key corresponding to (comparing) the class to which the stroke belongs ...enters the next stroke...subsequent strokes can be entered for further limit the list of candidate character’; p62, ‘use either selects a character or enters the subsequent letter of the intended Chinese character’s phonetic spelling’);

“means for converting said found stroke or phonetic sequences to one or more corresponding sequences representing phrases comprising two or more ideographic characters using said database” (p54-p55, ‘contents of word buffer 210 is used by input interpretation logic and database 214 to better select language unit candidates according to the context of recently entered language units’, ‘uses single-character word but frequently also use multi-character

words (corresponding to phrases)', 'uses a dictionary of ordinary words to select candidates of intended languages units'(converting); p61-p62, 'delivers candidates which are closely linked to the previous character(s) to form words or names (phrases), 'process can be repeated for subsequent Chinese characters (phrases)'); and

"an output device for displaying one or more found stroke or phonetic sequences, and one or more phrases corresponding to said found stroke or phonetic sequences" (p62, 'these candidates are displayed to the user', 'the display contains the stroke input history, the candidate characters and the candidate component symbols').

As per **claim 33** (depending on claim 29), WILLIAMS further discloses "said phonetic input system is a Pinyin system or a Zhuyin system" (p62-p63, 'Pinyin' and 'BoPoMoFo').

As per **claim 35** (depending on claim 29), WILLIAMS further discloses "prioritizing stroke or phonetic sequences that match an input sequence and prioritizing ideographic character sequences that match a matching stroke or phonetic sequence according to a linguistic model" (p59, 'the user enters the first written stroke by pressing a key corresponding to the class to the stroke belongs and is shown the occurrence frequency of characters beginning with that stroke (interpreted as prioritizing) in everyday language usage' (broadly interpreted as linguistic model)).

As per **claim 36** (depending on claim 35), WILLIAMS further discloses "said linguistic model comprises at least one of: ... ; frequency of occurrence of ideographic character sequences, stroke sequences or phonetic sequences in formal or conversational written text; frequency of occurrence of ideographic character sequences, stroke sequences or phonetic

Art Unit: 2626

sequences when following a preceding character or characters; ..." (p59, 'the occurrence frequency').

As per **claim 37** (depending on claim 29), WILLIAMS discloses "said phonetic sequences comprise single syllables" (p62, wherein entering 'Han Yu Pinyin' letters for 'word or name list' necessarily and/or inherently includes single syllables).

As per **claim 38** (depending on claim 29), WILLIAMS discloses "said phonetic sequences comprise both single and multiple syllables" (p62, wherein entering 'Han Yu Pinyin' letters for 'word or name list' necessarily and/or inherently includes both single syllables and multiple syllables).

As per **claim 39** (depending on claim 29), WILLIAMS further discloses "said phonetic sequences comprise user generated sequences" (p62, 'the user enters (generates) the first letter ...' then 'the user ...enters the subsequent letter (sequence) of the intended Chinese character's phonetic spelling').

As per **claim 40** (depending on claim 39), WILLIAMS further discloses "in absence of matching phonetic sequences in said database, a sequence of matching phonetic sequences is automatically generated based on single and optionally multiple syllable phonetic sequences" (p61-p62, 'when there are no more valid linkage (absence of matching) according to contextual relations between characters (such as multi-character words including the previous entered characters)...delivers (automatically generate) unlinked candidate characters' and 'the invocation of word association, whether by word or name list, is processed as previously described').

As per **claim 41** (depending on claim 40), WILLIAMS further discloses "said sequence of matching phonetic sequences is narrowed down through user interaction" (p59 and p62,

Art Unit: 2626

‘subsequence strokes (or Pinyin letters) can be entered to further limit the list of characters (narrowed down through user interaction)’).

As per **claim 42** (depending on claim 40), WILLIAMS further discloses “a sequence of matching ideographic character sequences is automatically generated based on matching phonetic sequences to ideographic character sequences” (p62, ‘these candidates (matched ideographic character sequences) are displayed ‘automatically generated)’).

As per **claim 43** (depending on claim 42), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 41, because the claim recites the same or similar limitations as claim 41.

As per **claim 51** (depending on claim 29), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 43, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 43.

As per **claim 52** (depending on claim 51), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 35, because the rejection for claim 35 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 52.

As per **claim 53** (depending on claim 52), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 36, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 36.

As per **claims 1**, it recites a method. The rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 29, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 29.

As per **claim 4** (depending to claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 1, because the rejection for claim 1 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 4.

Art Unit: 2626

As per **claims 5, 7-15, 21-23** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 33, 35-43, and 51-53 respectively, because the claims recite the same or similar limitation(s) as claims 33, 35-43 and 51-53 respectively.

As per **claim 24** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 48, because the rejection for claim 48 covers the same or similar limitation(s) of this claim.

As per **claim 25** (depending on claim 24), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 48, because the rejection for claim 48 covers the same or similar limitation(s) of this claim.

As per **claim 56**, it recites a computer usable medium. The rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 29, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 1.

As per **claims 60, 62-70 and 76-78** (depending on claim 56), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 33, 35-43 and 51-53 respectively, because the claims recite the same or similar limitation(s) as claims 33, 35-43 and 51-53 respectively.

As per **claim 79** (depending on claim 56), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 48, because the rejection for claim 48 covers the same or similar limitation(s) of this claim.

As per **claim 80** (depending on claim 79), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 48, because the rejection for claim 48 covers the same or similar limitation(s) of this claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. Claims 3, 16, 18-20, 31, 44-45, 48-50, 58, 71 and 73-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WILLIAMS in view of NI et al. (6,822,585 B1) hereinafter referenced as NI.

As per **claim 31** (depending on claim 29), WILLIAMS does not expressly disclose “said stroke input system is 5-stroke or 8-stroke system”. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by NI who discloses ‘input of symbols’ (title), comprising ‘any graphic glyph which can be inputted directly from a keyboard or a keypad’ and ‘the symbols include a alphabets, digits...character strokes and tone marks’ (col. 4, lines 21-26); ‘inputting characters into a terminal... having a plurality of keys’, ‘a number of the keys have associated with them a alphabet of different symbols (alternatively associated) which can be accessed and indicated in a display by means of single or multiple key selections or key presses of the keys’ (col. 4, lines 15-32), using ‘Chinese input dictionary which contains a mapping table of Pinyin string (phonetic characters) and matching Chinese characters (corresponding to ideographic database)’ (col. 6, lines 3-9), and that ‘the invention significantly simplifies the input of Pinyin (phonetic input) ... with carefully designed key mapping, this method can also improve other Chinese input methods ...such as Bopomofo or Wubizixin (five stroke input)’ (col. 11, lines 18-23), which suggests that Chinese dictionary (ideographic database) is necessarily associated with both Pinyin and stroke inputs and capable of allowing user select one of input methods. NI also teaches that ‘most of the existing Chinese input methods were original designed for PC keyboards’ and discloses the previous endeavor for a character input method that requires more basic input symbols than the number of keys on a keypad (col. 1, line 52 to col. 2, lines 40). Therefore, it would have been

Art Unit: 2626

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify WILLIAMS by providing input means with a plurality of keys that are associated with different symbols and using ideogram dictionary (database), such as Chinese input dictionary associated with input in both Pinyin method and Wubizixin (five stroke input) method, as taught by NI, for the purpose (motivation) of improving character input method (NI: col. 11, lines 21-23) for the system.

As per **claim 44** (depending on claim 35), WILLIAMS does not expressly disclose “changing the associated priority of the matching phonetic sequence and the sequence of ideographic characters once an ideographic character sequence is selected”. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by NI who further discloses ‘during input of text, a user is presented with a list of the Latin symbols in an order determined (changed) by the probability (associated priority) of being the next symbol rather than being in default, for example alphabetical order’, which suggests selection from the list may also changes the associated priority (order)’ (NI: col. 3, lines 66 to col. 4, line 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify WILLIAMS by providing a list of the symbols to determine the probability (associated priority) of being the next symbol rather than being in default, for example alphabetical order, as taught by NI, for the purpose (motivation) of improving character input method and/or providing the most probable symbols (NI: col. 11, lines 21-23 and col. 3, lines 64) for the system.

As per **claim 45** (depending on claim 29), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 31, because the rejection for claim 31 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 45, wherein a tone mark can be applied to Pinyin input.

As per **claim 48** (depending on claim 29), as stated above, WILLIAMS discloses that “the user is returned a sequence of phonetic sequences of exact matches” (p62, ‘the display contains the stroke input history, the candidate characters and the candidate component symbols’), but does not expressly discloses returning “predictions that partially match”. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by NI who further discloses ‘predicts the next Chinese character according to the context and a Chinese word database’ and shows partially match (26; col. 3, lines 49 and Fig. 5, blacks 25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify WILLIAMS by providing predicting the next Chinese character and returning partial partially match, as taught by NI, for the purpose (motivation) of improving character input method (NI: col. 11, lines 21-23) for the system.

As per **claim 49** (depending on claim 48), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 35, because the rejection for claim 35 covers the same or similar limitations as claim 49.

As per **claim 50** (depending on claim 49), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 36, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 36.

As per **claim 3** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 31, because the claim recites the same or similar limitations as claim 31.

As per **claim 16** (depending on claim 7), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 44, because the claim recites the same or similar limitations as claim 44.

As per **claims 18-20** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 48-20 respectively, because the claims recite the same or similar limitation(s) as claims 48-20 respectively.

As per **claim 58** (depending on claim 56), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 31, because the claim recites the same or similar limitations as claim 31.

As per **claim 71** (depending on claim 62), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 44, because the claim recites the same or similar limitations as claim 44.

As per **claims 73-75** (depending on claim 56), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 48-50 respectively, because the claims recite the same or similar limitation(s) as claims 48-50 respectively.

9. Claims 27, 46, 54-55 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WILLIAMS in view of ZHANG et al. (5,197,810) hereinafter referenced as ZHANG.

As per **claim 46** (depending on claim 29), WILLIAMS does not expressly disclose “one of said plurality of inputs is associated with a **special wildcard** input that is associated with any or all tones”. However, the feature of using a wildcard for inputting and displaying symbols/texts is well known in the art as evidenced by ZHANG who discloses method and system for inputting simplified forma and/or original complex form of Chinese character (title), comprising ‘Fuzzy auxiliary inputting method’ in which some special keys ‘can be used in substitution as a wild card’ or ‘can be used as the fuzzy key (wildcard key)’(col. 13, line 59 to col. 13, line 8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify WILLIAMS by providing an input method with wild

Art Unit: 2626

card used for substitution of input symbols or text, taught by ZHANG, for the purpose (motivation) of using the wild card in substitution of an input (ZHANG: col. 13, lines 62-63), such as input of Pinyin characters and/or strokes representing Chinese character components.

As per **claim 54** (depending on claim 29), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 46, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 46.

As per **claim 55** (depending on claim 29), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 46, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 46.

As per **claim 27** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 55, because the claim recites the same or similar limitations as claim 55.

As per **claim 81** (depending on claim 56), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 55, because the claim recites the same or similar limitations as claim 55.

10. Claims 17, 47 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WILLIAMS in view of KRAFT et al. (US 2003/0017858 A1) hereinafter referenced as KRAFT.

As per **claim 47** (depending on claim 29), WILLIAMS does not expressly disclose “the user can specify an explicit ideographic character separator”. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by KRAFT who discloses ‘data entry by string of possible candidate information’ (title), comprising ‘hard separator’ and ‘soft separator’ for separating input text (sentences or words) (p72). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify WILLIAMS by providing an separator for inputting text, for the purpose (motivation) of improving method of entering data into a communication terminal (KRAFT: p6).

Art Unit: 2626

As per **claim 17** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 47, because the claim recites the same or similar limitations as claim 47.

As per **claim 72** (depending on claim 56), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 47, because the claim recites the same or similar limitations as claim 47.

Conclusion

11. Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

Mail Stop _____
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: 571-273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: 571-273-8300, (for informal or draft communications, and please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

If no Mail Stop is indicated below, the line beginning Mail Stop should be omitted from the address.

Effective January 14, 2005, except correspondence for Maintenance Fee payments, Deposit Account Replenishments (see 1.25(c)(4)), and Licensing and Review (see 37 CFR 5.1(c) and 5.2(c)), please address correspondence to be delivered by other delivery services (Federal Express (Fed Ex), UPS, DHL, Laser, Action, Purolater, etc.) as follows:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop _____
Randolph Building
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qi Han whose telephone numbers is (571) 272-7604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil, can be reached on (571) 272-7602.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Inquiries regarding the status of submissions relating to an application or questions on the Private PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028 between the hours of 6 a.m. and midnight Monday through Friday EST, or by e-mail at: ebc@uspto.gov. For general information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

Application/Control Number: 10/803,255
Art Unit: 2626

Page 18

QH/qh
June 25, 2007



RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER